

~~SECRET~~

17 November 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of Printing Services
Division - September 1966

25X1

1. Allen Warfield's comments on Recommendations 3, 5, 6a and 7 are probably responsive enough so that you will not want to argue with him. I continue to feel that the format, layout, selection of photographs and graphics of some of the publications we reviewed during the survey were below acceptable standards. We talked this over thoroughly with [] and his people during the survey, brought specific examples to his attention, and embarrassed him enough so that he will probably do what he can about it. I suggest we let this one go.

2. On Recommendation No. 4 we had no "misunderstanding." The record shows that the apprentice program is normally five years and in most cases it has taken at least two years to get into the program. The average time to become a journeyman after entrance on duty was about seven years. With modern training techniques which ought to be available to the Agency, it seems to us that the work is not really complex enough to require this long period of time. The real reason is that over the years the unions in the printing trade have followed this pattern. I see no reason why we have to follow the customs and traditions which were developed in the early part of this century whether or not they are followed by the Government Printing Office. One of the main points is that PSD will be running out of skilled people in a few years when many people nearing or in their sixties will be retiring unless some way can be found to fill the pipeline. PSD, as you know, is having trouble recruiting new people. I have therefore drafted a polite comment for you to send to Col. White.

3. On Recommendation 6b we continue to feel, and I believe you gentlemen do too, that the sensitivity and amount of intelligence processed by PSD makes it a logical high priority espionage target. This will continue to be a problem after they move into their new building. PSD, whether we like it or not, is staffed with people who are probably more vulnerable for varying reasons than is the average Agency employee. I see no reason why this shouldn't be recognized by the Office of Security and the CI Staff and the reinvestigation program appropriately adjusted. Again I have drafted a polite note.


4. On Recommendation 8, the President's announced interest in a better safety program within government generally and our findings should be enough to elicit a more responsive comment. We agree that

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the two-man safety team is spread thin, but it seems not unreasonable to expect that they could have a report and an adequate monitoring program put together six months after we first brought this matter to their attention. A somewhat less polite comment on this point.

25X1



Attachment